

Coyote Street, P.O. Box 6003, Nevada City, CA 95959.

Dated: March 3, 1997.

John H. Skinner,

*Forest Supervisor, Tahoe National Forest.*

[FR Doc. 97-5920 Filed 3-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-11-M

## COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

### Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the Indiana Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the Indiana Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 1:00 p.m. and adjourn at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 27, 1997, at the South Bend Public Library, 304 South Main Street, South Bend, Indiana 44601. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss civil rights issues of interest and plan future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Committee Chairperson Paul Chase, 317-920-3190, or Constance Davis, Director of the Midwestern Regional Office, 312-353-8311 (TDD 312-353-8362). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least five (5) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, March 3, 1997.

Carol-Lee Hurley,

*Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.*

[FR Doc. 97-5970 Filed 3-10-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335-01-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-427-812]

### Calcium Aluminate Flux From France; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request from one respondent, Lafarge Aluminates

(LA), and its U.S. subsidiary, Lafarge Calcium Aluminates, Inc. (LCA) (collectively, Lafarge), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on calcium aluminate (CA) flux from France. This review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, Lafarge, for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

We have preliminarily determined that U.S. sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service (Customs) to assess antidumping duties equal to the differences between the United States Price (USP) and NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issues, and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 11, 1997.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Maureen McPhillips or Linda Ludwig, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-3019.

#### The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On June 13, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register (59 FR 30337) the antidumping duty order on CA flux from France. On June 6, 1996 (61 FR 28840), the Department published in the Federal Register a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on CA flux from France. In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(1)(1995), we received a timely request for review from a respondent, Lafarge. We published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty

administrative review on August 8, 1996 (61 FR 41373), for the period June 1, 1995 through May 31, 1996.

The Department is now conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

#### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of CA flux, other than white, high purity CA flux. This product contains by weight more than 32 percent but less than 65 percent alumina and more than one percent each of iron and silica.

CA flux is currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheading 2523.10.0000. The HTSUS subheading is provided for convenience and U.S. Customs' purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order remains dispositive.

#### Constructed Export Price

In calculating Lafarge's USP, the Department treated respondent's sales as constructed export price (CEP) sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold to the first unaffiliated purchaser after importation into the United States.

We calculated CEP based on packed or bulk, ex-U.S. warehouse or delivered prices to unaffiliated customers in the United States. We made deductions from the gross unit price, where appropriate, for the following movement charges: loading material at the Fos plant in France, foreign inland freight from plant to port, foreign brokerage and handling costs, international freight, marine insurance, U.S. brokerage and handling, inland freight from port to U.S. warehouse, unloading charges, inland freight to processors, demurrage and stop-off charges, and U.S. freight from the warehouse to the customer, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act. Pursuant to section 772(d)(1)(B), we also deducted credit expenses, product liability insurance, and travel expenses for technical services. Pursuant to section 772(d)(1)(D), we deducted U.S. indirect selling expenses, and inventory carrying costs incurred in the United States. We did not deduct indirect selling expenses (*i.e.*, administrative expenses, inventory carrying costs, personnel costs for technicians) incurred by LA in France because these expenses were for commercial activity taking place outside the United States. We also deducted commissions in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(A) of the Act.

We also deducted an amount for profit in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.